

SDE Legislative Proposals – 2013

<u>Page #</u>	<u>Topic</u>
2	Minimum Budget Requirement
6	Alliance Districts Carry Forward
9	School Readiness Administrative Set-aside
12	Charter School Payment Date
16	Sheff Start-up Funds
19	Magnet Operator Clarification
22	Special Education Study
25	New Magnet Operators
29	SASID proposal
32	PSIS/SLDS Name Change
37	School Readiness Flexibility
40	School Readiness Annual Progress Reporting
43	School Readiness MOU
46	Fingerprint Data Sharing
49	Head Start Advisory Council

Agency Legislative Proposal - 2013 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): 082412_SDE_MBRFix

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: State Department of Education (SDE)

Liaison: Sarah Hemingway

Phone: 860-713-6493

E-mail: Sarah.Hemingway@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Division of Finance and Internal Operations

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Lynn Nauss

Title of Proposal: Minor Revision to Minimum Budget Requirement

Statutory Reference CGS 10-4b

Proposal Summary

The current language of CGS 10-4b continues to reflect minimum expenditure requirement (MER), rather than minimum budget requirement (MBR). To ensure that the agency has correct language upon which to base compliance, we require a technical correction.

Please attach a copy of fully drafted bill (required for review)

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- Reason for Proposal

Please consider the following, if applicable:

Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary? Yes

Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? N/A

Have certain constituencies called for this action? N/A

What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session? Need to pursue next session.

- Origin of Proposal

☐ New Proposal

☒ Resubmission

If this is a resubmission, please share:

What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package? We believe that there was confusion over the need for the 10-4b change during the spring of 2012.

Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal? This is a technical fix; no improvements deemed warranted.

Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation? OLR/Judith Lohman.

What was the last action taken during the past legislative session? SDE submitted both the CGS 10-4a and 10-4b changes as a pair of technical fixes. It is our understanding that there was confusion which allowed the 10-4a correction to move forward without the corresponding 10-4b fix.

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: N/A

Agency Contact (name, title, phone):

Date Contacted:

Approve of Proposal ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ Talks Ongoing

Summary of Affected Agency's Comments

Will there need to be further negotiation? ☐ YES ☐ NO

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) NONE

State NONE.

Federal NONE

Additional notes on fiscal impact

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

The SDE requires this technical fix to allow it to enforce action for noncompliance with the MBR.

PROPOSED FIX TO CGS 10-4b

Sec. 10-4b. Complaint alleging failure or inability of board of education to implement educational interests of state. Investigation; inquiry; hearing. Remedial process. Regulations. (a) Any resident of a local or regional school district, or parent or guardian of a student enrolled in the public schools of such school district who has been unable to resolve a complaint with the board of education of such local or regional school district may file with the State Board of Education a complaint in writing, or the state board may initiate a complaint, alleging the failure or inability of the board of education of such local or regional school district to implement the educational interests of the state in accordance with section 10-4a. If the state board, or its designee, finds such complaint to be substantial, it shall notify the local or regional board of such complaint and shall designate an agent who shall conduct a prompt investigation in accordance with procedures established by said state board and report the results of such investigation to the state board. The agent of the State Board of Education, in conducting an investigation, may summon by subpoena any records or documents related to the investigation. If the findings indicate that there is reasonable cause to believe that a local or regional board of education has failed or is unable to make reasonable provision to implement the educational interests of the state as defined in section 10-4a or that a local governmental body or its agent is responsible for such failure or inability, said state board shall conduct an inquiry. The State Board of Education shall give the board of education or a local governmental body or its agent involved the opportunity to be heard in accordance with the provisions of sections 4-176e to 4-184. Said state board may summon by subpoena any person whose testimony may be pertinent to the inquiry and any records or documents related to the provision of public education in the school district.

(b) If, after conducting an inquiry in accordance with subsection (a) of this section, the state board finds that a local or regional board of education has failed or is unable to implement the educational interests of the state in accordance with section 10-4a, the state board shall (1) require the local or regional board of education to engage in a remedial process whereby such local or regional board of education shall develop and implement a plan of action through which compliance may be attained, or (2) order the local or regional board of education to take reasonable steps where such local or regional board has failed to comply with subdivision (3) of section 10-4a. Where a local or regional board of education is required to implement a remedial process pursuant to subdivision (1) of this subsection, upon request of such local or regional board, the state board shall make available to such local or regional board materials and advice to assist in such remedial process. If the state board finds that a local governmental body or its agent is responsible for such failure or inability, the state board may order such governmental body or agent to take reasonable steps to comply with the requirements of section 10-4a. The state board may not order an increase in the ~~[regular program expenditures]~~ **budgeted appropriation for education** ~~[, as defined in section 10-262f,]~~ of such local or regional board of education if such ~~[expenditures]~~ **budgeted appropriations** are in an amount at least equal to the minimum ~~[expenditure]~~ **budget** requirement in accordance with section ~~[10-262i]~~ **10-262i** ~~[, provided that an increase in expenditures may be ordered in accordance with section 10-76d]~~. If the state board finds that the state is responsible for such failure, the state board shall so notify the Governor and the

General Assembly.

(c) Upon the failure of a local or regional board of education to implement a remedial process, or upon the failure of a local or regional board of education or local governmental body or its agent to comply with an order of the state board in accordance with subsection (b) of this section, said state board may seek an order from the Superior Court to compel such board of education to implement a remedial process or to compel a local or regional board of education or local governmental body or its agent to carry out the order of the State Board of Education.

(d) The state board shall pursuant to the provisions of chapter 54 adopt regulations concerning procedures for purposes of this section.

Agency Legislative Proposal - 2013 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): 082412_SDE_AllianceCarryForward

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: State Department of Education (SDE)

Liaison: Sarah Hemingway

Phone: 860-713-6493

E-mail: Sarah.Hemingway@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Division of Finance and Internal Operations

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Lynn Nauss

Title of Proposal Alliance Carry Forward

Statutory Reference Sec. 34 of PA 12-116

Proposal Summary

In the Department's comprehensive reform package, alliance districts are eligible to spend their increased ECS aid in accordance with SDE-approved spending plans. It is likely, given individual local initiatives, that some of the grantees will not exhaust their grant funds in the current fiscal year. In such instances, the Department supports the continued expenditure of those funds in fiscal year 2014.

Please attach a copy of fully drafted bill (required for review)

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- Reason for Proposal

Please consider the following, if applicable:

Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary? Yes

Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? N/A

Have certain constituencies called for this action? N/A

What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session? Grantees would suffer the loss of any funds not expended during the current fiscal year. Some larger, worthwhile, local initiatives might go unfulfilled.

- Origin of Proposal

☒ New Proposal

☐ Resubmission

If this is a resubmission, please share:

What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?

Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?

Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?

What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: N/A; Specific to education

Agency Contact (name, title, phone):

Date Contacted:

Approve of Proposal ___ YES ___ NO ___ Talks Ongoing

Summary of Affected Agency's Comments

Will there need to be further negotiation? ___ YES ___ NO

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) NONE

State NONE

Federal
NONE

Additional notes on fiscal impact

N/A

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

In many instances, the increased ECS aid tied to these SDE-approved plans is significant. The Department encourages the best use of these funds to assist in the reform effort. Allowing districts to carry their awards into a second year, if necessary, is seen as integral to the comprehensive reform process.

PROPOSED FIX TO PA 12-116

Sec. 34. (NEW) (*Effective July 1, 2012*) (a) As used in this section and section 10-262i of the general statutes, as amended by this act:

(1) "Alliance district" means a school district that is in a town that is among the towns with the lowest district performance indices.

<removed items (2) through (6) for brevity>

(7) "Educational reform district" means a school district that is in a town that is among the ten lowest district performance indices when all towns are ranked highest to lowest in district performance indices scores.

(b) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013, the Commissioner of Education shall designate thirty school districts as alliance districts. Any school district designated as an alliance district shall be so designated for a period of five years. On or before June 30, 2016, the Department of Education shall determine if there are any additional alliance districts.

(c) (1) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Comptroller shall withhold from a town designated as an alliance district any increase in funds received over the amount the town received for the prior fiscal year pursuant to section 10-262h of the general statutes, as amended by this act. The Comptroller shall transfer such funds to the Commissioner of Education.

(2) Upon receipt of an application pursuant to subsection (d) of this section, the Commissioner of Education may award such funds to the local or regional board of education for an alliance district on the condition that such funds shall be expended in accordance with the plan described in subsection (d) of this section and any guidelines developed by the State Board of Education for such funds. Such funds shall be used to improve student achievement in such alliance district and to offset any other local education costs approved by the commissioner.

(3) The unexpended balance of funds appropriated to the Department of Education, for education equalization grants as provided for, in section 1 of Public Act 12-1 of the June special session, for the purpose described in this subsection, shall not lapse on June 30, 2013, and such funds shall continue to be available for expenditure for such purpose during the fiscal year ending June 30, 2014.

Agency Legislative Proposal - 2013 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc):
082412_SDE_SchoolReadinessAdminSetaside

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: State Department of Education

Liaison: Sarah Hemingway
Phone: 860-713-6493
E-mail: Sarah.Hemingway@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Division of Finance and Internal Affairs

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Lynn Nauss

Title of Proposal **Minor revision to administrative set aside for school readiness**

Statutory Reference CGS 10-16p(e)(3), as amended by Sec. 1 of PA 12-50

Proposal Summary

The administrative set aside for the school readiness grant has historically been defined as \$198,200. This is inconsistent with the administrative set asides for other grants managed by the agency, which are determined by a “percentage of appropriation”. Further, \$198,200 will be insufficient to cover planned salary increases over the biennium. Moving to a percentage of appropriation would 1) make this setaside language consistent with that of other SDE grants, 2) eliminate the need to revisit this issue every two years, 3) allow the department to cover the salaries of the staff funded through this setaside.

Please attach a copy of fully drafted bill (required for review)

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

• Reason for Proposal

Please consider the following, if applicable:

Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary? No

Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? N/A

Have certain constituencies called for this action? N/A

What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session? We would require some alternate language around an administrative set aside for this grant.

- **Origin of Proposal** ☒ New Proposal ☐ Resubmission

If this is a resubmission, please share: n/a

What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?

Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?

Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?

What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: N/A

Agency Contact (name, title, phone):

Date Contacted:

Approve of Proposal ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ Talks Ongoing

Summary of Affected Agency's Comments

Will there need to be further negotiation? ☐ YES ☐ NO

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) NONE

State MINIMAL. To cover salary increases over the next biennium, the department projects a need for approximately \$208,000 in year one of the biennium, and approximately \$221,000 in year two.

Federal NONE

Additional notes on fiscal impact

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

- Redirecting the funds to cover the anticipated salary needs would mean that approximately \$20,000 would be diverted from School Readiness program slots. In a given year, due to typical student movement in and out of programs, this account ends the fiscal year with a surplus. It is not anticipated that the redirection of a small portion of funds from program to admin would significantly alter the program itself.

PROPOSED FIX TO CGS 10-16p(e)(3), AS AMENDED BY SEC. 1 OF PA 12-50

(3) Notwithstanding subdivision (2) of this subsection, for the fiscal years ending June 30, 2008, to June 30, 2013, inclusive, the Department of Education may retain up to one hundred ninety-eight thousand two hundred dollars of the amount appropriated for purposes of this section for coordination, program evaluation and administration. **For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2014, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Department of Education may expend an amount not to exceed one-third of one percent of the amount appropriated for purposes of this section for coordination, program evaluation and administration.**

Agency Legislative Proposal - 2013 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): 082412_SDE_CharterSchoolPayment

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: State Department of Education (SDE)

Liaison: Sarah Hemingway

Phone: 860-713-6493

E-mail: Sarah.Hemingway@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Division of Finance and Internal Operations

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Lynn Nauss

Title of Proposal **Technical fix to charter school payment dates**

Statutory Reference Sec. 19 of PA 12-2 JSS

Proposal Summary

In changing the payment process for charter grants to allow funds to go to the town, rather than directly to the schools, there was an error around the timing of the April payments.

Please attach a copy of fully drafted bill (required for review)

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- **Reason for Proposal**

Please consider the following, if applicable:

Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary? Yes

Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? N/A

Have certain constituencies called for this action? N/A

What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session? Need to pursue again next session.

- **Origin of Proposal**

☒ **New Proposal**

☐ **Resubmission**

If this is a resubmission, please share:

What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?

Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?

Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?

What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: N/A

Agency Contact (name, title, phone):

Date Contacted:

Approve of Proposal ___ YES ___ NO ___ Talks Ongoing

Summary of Affected Agency's Comments

Will there need to be further negotiation? ___ YES ___ NO

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) NONE

State NONE

Federal NONE

Additional notes on fiscal impact

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

Technical correction only.

PROPOSED FIX TO PA 12-2 JSS

Sec. 19. Subsections (c) and (d) of section 10-66ee of the 2012 supplement to the general statutes, as amended by section 29 of public act 12-116, are repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective July 1, 2012*):

(c) (1) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2014, and each fiscal year thereafter, the State Board of Education may approve, within available appropriations, a per student grant to a local charter school described in subsection (b) of section 31 of [this act] public act 12-116 act in an amount not to exceed three thousand dollars for each student enrolled in such local charter school, provided the local or regional board of education for such local charter school and the representatives of the exclusive bargaining unit for certified employees, chosen pursuant to section 10-153b, mutually agree on staffing flexibility in such local charter school, and such agreement is approved by the State Board of Education. For the purposes of equalization aid grants pursuant to section 10-262h, as amended by [this act] public act 12-116, the state shall make such payments, in accordance with this subsection, to the town in which a local charter school is located as follows: Twenty-five per cent of the amount not later than July [first] fifteenth and September first based on estimated student enrollment on May first, and twenty-five per cent of the amount not later than January first and the remaining amount not later than April ~~[fifteenth]~~ first, each based on student enrollment on October first.

(2) The town shall pay to the fiscal authority for a local charter school the portion of the amount paid to the town pursuant to subdivision (1) of this subsection attributable for students enrolled in such local charter school. Such payments shall be made as follows: Twenty-five per cent of the amount not later than July [fifteenth] twentieth and September fifteenth and twenty-five per cent of the amount not later than January fifteenth and the remaining amount not later than April fifteenth.

(d) (1) For the purposes of equalization aid grants pursuant to section 10-262h, as amended by [this act] public act 12-116, the state shall pay in accordance with this subsection, to the town in which a state charter school is located for each student enrolled in such school, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013, ten thousand five hundred dollars, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2014, eleven thousand dollars, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015, and each fiscal year thereafter, eleven thousand five hundred dollars. Such payments shall be made as follows: Twenty-five per cent of the amount not later than July [first] fifteenth and September first based on estimated student enrollment on May first, and twenty-five per cent of the amount not later than January first and the remaining amount not later than April ~~[fifteenth]~~ first, each based on student enrollment on October first.

(2) The town shall pay to the fiscal authority for a state charter school the portion of the amount paid to the town pursuant to subdivision (1) of this subsection attributable for students enrolled in such state charter school. Such payments shall be made as follows: Twenty-five per cent of the amount not later than July [fifteenth] twentieth and September fifteenth and twenty-five per cent of the amount not later than January fifteenth and the remaining amount not later than April fifteenth.

(3) In the case of a student identified as requiring special education, the school district in which the student resides shall: (A) Hold the planning and placement team meeting for such student and shall invite representatives from the charter school to participate in such meeting; and (B) pay the state charter school, on a quarterly basis, an amount equal to the difference between the reasonable cost of educating such student and the sum of the amount received by the state charter school for such student pursuant to subdivision (2) of this subsection and amounts received from other state, federal, local or private sources calculated on a per pupil basis. Such school district shall be eligible for reimbursement pursuant to section 10-76g. The charter school a student requiring special education attends shall be responsible for ensuring that such student receives the services mandated by the student's individualized education program whether such services are provided by the charter school or by the school district in which the student resides.

Agency Legislative Proposal - 2013 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): 082412_SDE_SheffStartupFunds

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: State Department of Education (SDE)

Liaison: Sarah Hemingway

Phone: 860-713-6493

E-mail: Sarah.Hemingway@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Division of Finance and Internal Operations

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Lynn Nauss

Title of Proposal **Technical fix to Sheff capital start-up funds bond language**

Statutory Reference Sec. 42 of PA 12-189

Proposal Summary

It appears that as the bond bill was amended over time, it was renumbered and in the final version, the reference for Sheff was not corrected.

Please attach a copy of fully drafted bill (required for review)

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- **Reason for Proposal**

Please consider the following, if applicable:

Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary? Yes

Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? N/A

Have certain constituencies called for this action? N/A

What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session? Need to pursue again next session.

- **Origin of Proposal**

☒ **_x_ New Proposal**

☐ **___ Resubmission**

If this is a resubmission, please share:

What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?

Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?

Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?

What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: n/a

Agency Contact (name, title, phone):

Date Contacted:

Approve of Proposal ___ YES ___ NO ___ Talks Ongoing

Summary of Affected Agency's Comments

Will there need to be further negotiation? ___ YES ___ NO

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) NONE

State

NONE

Federal

NONE

Additional notes on fiscal impact

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

Technical Correction only.

PROPOSED FIX TO PA 12-189

Sec. 42. (*Effective from passage*) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 15 of this act, grants-in-aid for capital start-up costs paid to the Capitol Region Education Council, in accordance with subdivision (1) of subsection ~~((f))~~ (e) of section 9 of this act, and used pursuant to said subdivision shall not be subject to lien or repayment.

Agency Legislative Proposal - 2013 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc):
082412_SDE_MagnetOperatorClarification

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: State Department of Education

Liaison: Sarah Hemingway

Phone: 860-713-6493

E-mail: Sarah.Hemingway@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Division of Finance and Internal Operations

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Lynn Nauss

Title of Proposal **Technical fix to magnet operating prior year adjustments to clarify approach**

Statutory Reference CGS 10-264I(d) as amended by Sec. 5 of PA 12-120

Proposal Summary

This language is necessary to clarify that when determining if a magnet operating grant refund is due for a prior year, the adjustment will be based upon the amount of the grants received by the operator/grantee, and not determined at the individual school level.

Please attach a copy of fully drafted bill (required for review)

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- **Reason for Proposal**

Please consider the following, if applicable:

Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary? Yes

Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? N/A

Have certain constituencies called for this action? N/A

What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session? Would pursue next session.

- **Origin of Proposal**

☒ **New Proposal**

☐ **Resubmission**

If this is a resubmission, please share: During the spring 2012 session, the department sought and received a technical fix for this section of law. It was too late in the session to get all that we wanted in the way of a fix. We feel that this proposal will allow us to better capture the intent and practice used in the determination of these magnet operating prior-year adjustments.

*What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?
Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?
Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?
What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?*

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: n/a

Agency Contact (name, title, phone):

Date Contacted:

Approve of Proposal ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ Talks Ongoing

Summary of Affected Agency's Comments

Will there need to be further negotiation? ☐ YES ☐ NO

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) NONE

State
NONE

Federal
NONE

Additional notes on fiscal impact

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

The SDE requires this technical fix to support its calculation of prior-year adjustments for the magnet operating grant. As this is relatively new language for the Department, we wish to ensure that the supporting legislation accurately reflects the intent and calculation methodology applied.

10-264I(d) Grants made pursuant to this section, except those made pursuant to subdivision (6) of subsection (c) of this section, shall be paid as follows: Seventy per cent by September first and the balance by May first of each fiscal year. The May first payment shall be adjusted to reflect actual interdistrict magnet school program enrollment as of the preceding October first using the data of record as of the intervening March first, if the actual level of enrollment is lower than the projected enrollment stated in the approved grant application. The May first payment shall be further adjusted for the difference between the total grant received by the magnet school operator in the prior fiscal year and the ~~preliminary~~ revised total grant amount calculated for the ~~current~~ prior fiscal year in cases where the aggregate financial audit submitted by the interdistrict magnet school operator pursuant to subdivision (1) of subsection (n) of this section indicates an overpayment by the department.

Agency Legislative Proposal - 2013 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): 082712_SDE_SpecialEdIdentification

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: State Department of Education

Liaison: Sarah Hemingway

Phone: 860-713-6493

E-mail: Sarah.Hemingway@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Bureau of Data Collection, Research, and Evaluation

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Diane Murphy

Title of Proposal: Inappropriate Identification for Special Education

Statutory Reference : Public Act 12-116 Sec. 90 b.

Proposal Summary: Substitute one word in subsection b of section 90. Delete “correlation” and insert “association”. This is a technical amendment only.

Please attach a copy of fully drafted bill (required for review)

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- **Reason for Proposal**

The section calls for the department to conduct a correlation study. In this case, a correlation is statistically inappropriate and would not be possible. By substituting the word association, the department has the ability to apply the appropriate analytic tool and thereby carry out the intent of the law.

- **Origin of Proposal** ☒ **New Proposal** ☐ **Resubmission**

The bureau of special education originally believed this section would be removed from the education reform bill, after having met with the constituents raising the issue. This is work the department currently conducts under federal law (IDEA 2004). When the bill officially passed, the bureau was surprised to see this section was included in the education reform legislation. The issue of the accuracy in terminology is being raised by analytic consultants the bureau of data collection, research and evaluation.

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: None Agency Contact (name, title, phone): Date Contacted: Approve of Proposal ___ YES ___ NO ___ Talks Ongoing
Summary of Affected Agency's Comments
Will there need to be further negotiation? ___ YES ___ NO

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) NONE
State NONE
Federal NONE
Additional notes on fiscal impact

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

Technical amendment.

(NEW) (*Effective July 1, 2012*) (a) Any local or regional board of education identified by the Department of Education that disproportionately and inappropriately identifies minority students as requiring special education services because such students have a reading deficiency in contravention of the provisions of subparagraph (A) of subdivision (4) of subsection (a) of section 10-76ff of the general statutes, shall annually submit a report to the department on the plan adopted by such board that reduces the misidentification of such minority students by improving reading assessments and interventions for students in kindergarten to grade three, inclusive.

(b) The Department of Education shall study the plans and strategies used by a local or regional board of education that demonstrate improvement in the reduction of the misidentification of minority students

requiring special education under this section. Such study shall examine the ~~[correlation]~~ association between improvements in teacher training in the science of reading and the reduction in misidentification of students requiring special education services

(c) For purposes of this section, "minority students" means those whose race is defined as other than white, or whose ethnicity is defined as Hispanic or Latino by the federal Office of Management and Budget for use by the Bureau of Census of the United States Department of Commerce.

Agency Legislative Proposal - 2013 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): 083012_SDE_MagnetOperators

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: State Department of Education

Liaison: Sarah Hemingway

Phone: 860-713-6493

E-mail: Sarah.Hemingway@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Bureau of Choice Programs

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Mark Linabury/Karen Flanagan

Title of Proposal: New Magnet Operators

Statutory Reference Sec. 10-264l.

Proposal Summary: To allow other entities to operate Magnet schools in through an independent governing council in accordance with specific guidelines

Please attach a copy of fully drafted bill (required for review)

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- **Reason for Proposal**

This will allow for additional Magnet School operators, which will assist in meeting the goals of Sheff.

- **Origin of Proposal** x **New Proposal** **Resubmission**

If this is a resubmission, please share:

What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?

Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?

Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?

What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: NONE

Agency Contact (name, title, phone):

Date Contacted:

Approve of Proposal ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ Talks Ongoing

Summary of Affected Agency's Comments

Will there need to be further negotiation? ☐ YES ☐ NO

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) NONE

State

NONE

Federal

NONE

Additional notes on fiscal impact

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

Sec. 10-264I. Grants for the operation of interdistrict magnet school programs. Transportation. Special education. Tuition. (a) The Department of Education shall, within available appropriations, establish a

grant program (1) to assist (A) local and regional boards of education, (B) regional educational service centers, (C) the Board of Trustees of the Community-Technical Colleges on behalf of Quinebaug Valley Community College, and (D) cooperative arrangements pursuant to section 10-158a, and (2) in assisting the state in meeting the goals of the 2008 stipulation and order for Milo Sheff, et al. v. William A. O'Neill, et al., as determined by the Commissioner of Education, to assist (A) the Board of Trustees of the Community-Technical Colleges on behalf of a regional community-technical college, (B) the Board of Trustees of the Connecticut State University System on behalf of a state university, (C) the Board of Trustees of The University of Connecticut on behalf of the university, (D) the board of governors for an independent college or university, as defined in section 10a-37, or the equivalent of such a board, on behalf of the independent college or university, and (E) any other third-party not-for-profit corporation approved by the commissioner with the operation of interdistrict magnet school programs. **Any such approved entity, as specified in subsection (a)(2) of this section, shall establish an independent governing council to operate the interdistrict magnet school program which shall have the power to : (1) apply for, receive directly, and expend any state or federal money for which it may be eligible; (2) hold title to real or personal property; (3) employ personal; (4) enter into contracts and act as the Board of Education for purposes of collective bargaining. Such governing council shall include teachers and parents and guardians of students enrolled in the school, the superintendent, or his/her designee, of the local or regional board of education of the town in which the interdistrict magnet school is located, and the superintendent, or his/her designee, of the local or regional board of education of each town from which twenty percent of the students enrolled in the interdistrict magnet school program are resident students. Any governing council established pursuant to this section shall be a public agency for purposes of the Freedom of Information Act, as defined in section 1-200.** All interdistrict magnet schools, including those specified in subsection (a)(2) of this section, shall be operated in conformance with the same laws and regulations applicable to public schools. For the purposes of this section "an interdistrict magnet school program" means a program which (i) supports racial, ethnic and economic diversity, (ii) offers a special and high quality curriculum, and (iii) requires students who are enrolled to attend at least half-time. An interdistrict magnet school program does not include a regional agricultural science and technology school, a regional vocational-technical school or a regional special education center. On and after July 1, 2000, the governing authority for each interdistrict magnet school program that is in operation prior to July 1, 2005, shall restrict the number of students that may enroll in the program from a participating district to eighty per cent of the total enrollment of the program. The governing authority for each interdistrict magnet school program that begins operations on or after July 1, 2005, shall restrict the number of students that may enroll in the program from a participating district to seventy-five per cent of the total enrollment of the program, and maintain such a school enrollment that at least twenty-five per cent but not more than seventy-five per cent of the students enrolled are pupils of racial minorities, as defined in section 10-226a.

(k) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2009, any tuition charged to a local or regional board of education by a regional educational service center operating an interdistrict magnet school shall be in an amount equal to at least seventy-five per cent of the difference between (1) the average per pupil expenditure of the magnet school for the prior fiscal year, and (2) the amount of any per pupil state subsidy

calculated under subsection (c) of this section plus any revenue from other sources calculated on a per pupil basis. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010, any tuition charged to a local or regional board of education by a regional educational service center operating an interdistrict magnet school for any student enrolled in such interdistrict magnet school shall be in an amount equal to at least ninety per cent of the difference between (A) the average per pupil expenditure of the magnet school for the prior fiscal year, and (B) the amount of any per pupil state subsidy calculated under subsection (c) of this section plus any revenue from other sources calculated on a per pupil basis. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2011, and each fiscal year thereafter, any tuition charged to a local or regional board of education by a regional educational service center or other entity operating an interdistrict magnet school for any student enrolled in such interdistrict magnet school **as approved by the Commissioner pursuant to section 10-264l(a)(2)(E)** shall be in an amount equal to the difference between (i) the average per pupil expenditure of the magnet school for the prior fiscal year, and (ii) the amount of any per pupil state subsidy calculated under subsection (c) of this section plus any revenue from other sources calculated on a per pupil basis. If any such board of education fails to pay such tuition, the commissioner may withhold from such board's town or towns a sum payable under section 10-262i in an amount not to exceed the amount of the unpaid tuition to the magnet school and pay such money to the fiscal agent for the magnet school as a supplementary grant for the operation of the interdistrict magnet school program. In no case shall the sum of such tuitions exceed the difference between (I) the total expenditures of the magnet school for the prior fiscal year, and (II) the total per pupil state subsidy calculated under subsection (c) of this section plus any revenue from other sources. The commissioner may conduct a comprehensive financial review of the operating budget of a magnet school to verify such tuition rate.

Agency Legislative Proposal - 2013 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): 0824_SDE_SASIDInclusion

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: State Department of Education (SDE)

Liaison: Sarah Hemingway

Phone: 860-713-6493

E-mail: Sarah.Hemingway@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Division of Finance and Internal Operations

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: David Williamson and Martin Rose

Title of Proposal: State-Assigned Student Identifier (SASID) inclusion changes

Statutory Reference: Chapter 163, section 10-10b and Chapter 185, section 10a-55j

Proposal Summary

To change the current statute to require that the State-Assigned Student Identifier (SASID) be the default ID required on all transcripts, report cards and other student official documents.

Please attach a copy of fully drafted bill (required for review)

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- **Reason for Proposal**

To facilitate building a State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS), a system which is designed to track student data from Pre-K through Grade 12, the SLDS needed a unique state-assigned student identifier (SASID) to match student data.

SDE is finding that the SASID is rapidly becoming the key data element in linking student data across the state PreK-12 population as well as being used to link other state agency services and post-secondary institutions. Unfortunately, as the SASID evolves into a key student identifier, many parents and students do not readily know their child's SASID due to underexposure of this key element in official correspondence.

Also, as we facilitate a holistic student state services view, the linking of student data between SDE and other agencies including DCF, DSS and DPH require the SASID be the primary key. Without this key, a costly complicated process needs to be deployed, because the SASID is not readily available to parents and students when they fill out documentation for these agencies' services.

Finally, as CT students move to and from secondary school to CT post-secondary schools, the SASID is the key link to student information as that student's records are moved. With the SASID on student transcripts, the admissions process becomes much easier and more cost effective to the state.

This proposal is designed to make the SASID the default ID on transcripts, report cards and other

student official documents so students or parents can easily find the SASID when needed. Re-wording the current statutes does not eliminate a local unique identifier from being used; it simply requires the SASID to be the default ID required.

- *Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary?*

Yes, there have been new state statutes that require the linking of student data to DCF and Board of Regents.

- *Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)?*

Yes, other states have found that having the SASID on all student-related official communications will help parents and students with easy access to the SASID. This helps parents and students fill out other important state services documents that will improve student information linking both internally among SDE State Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) and to other agencies including DSS, DCF and DPH and with the Board of Regents State University and Community College System.

- *Have certain constituencies called for this action?*

No

- *What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session?*

Districts would have to add the SASID to transcripts, report cards and any other official student documents that are sent to student and parents. Some districts have already added the SASID to report cards and transcripts but the majority has not. Adding this number is not complicated or costly, and LEAs can still use their unique identifier alongside the SASID.

- **Origin of Proposal** ☒ **New Proposal** ☐ **Resubmission**

If this is a resubmission, please share:

What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?

Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?

Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?

What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: Board of Regents for Higher Education

Agency Contact (name, title, phone): Braden Hosch, Director of Policy and Research, 860-493-0235

Date Contacted: Various

Approve of Proposal ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ Talks Ongoing

Summary of Affected Agency's Comments OK with proposal

Will there need to be further negotiation? ____ YES ☒_x_ NO

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) NONE

State NONE

Federal NONE

Additional notes on fiscal impact

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

N/A

Chapter 163, section 10a-10b

Sec. 10-10b. **Inclusion on student transcripts ~~[of unique identifier or]~~ , report cards, and other official student documents of state-assigned student identifier (SASID).** The Department of Education shall require all school districts to include on each student's transcript, report cards and other official student documents such student's unique identifier or state-assigned student identifier.

Chapter 185, section 10a-55j

Sec. 10a-55j. Tracking of ~~[unique identifiers or]~~ state-assigned student identifiers (SASID). The Board of Regents for Higher Education shall require each public institution of higher education and each independent institution of higher education that receives state funding to track the ~~[unique identifiers or]~~ state-assigned student identifiers, which are assigned by the Department of Education to public school students, of all in-state students of such institution until such students graduate from or terminate enrollment at such institution.

Agency Legislative Proposal - 2013 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): 082712_SDE_P SIS

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: State Department of Education (SDE)

Liaison: Sarah Hemingway

Phone: 860-713-6493

E-mail: Sarah.Hemingway@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Performance Office: Bureau of Data Collection, Research and Evaluation

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Karen Addesso and Kendra Shakir

Title of Proposal: Language Change with Respect to PSIS and SLDS

Statutory Reference : Section 10-10a of the C.G.S.

Proposal Summary The phrase “state longitudinal data system” should be substituted for “state-wide public school information system” in the legislative language under this section.

Please attach a copy of fully drafted bill (required for review)

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- **Reason for Proposal**

CSDE’s State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) is not the state-wide public school information system (PSIS). PSIS is a student-level data collection that is submitted to the state from all of the public school districts in the state. SLDS consists of several data collections and data applications, a data warehouse, and a security manager to provide both public and secure access to the agency’s data. The phrase “state longitudinal data system” should be substituted for “state-wide public school information system” in the legislative language under this section.

- **Origin of Proposal** x New Proposal Resubmission

This change in language will provide clarification around the complexity of the Bureau’s work.

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: None Agency Contact (name, title, phone): Date Contacted: Approve of Proposal ___ YES ___ NO ___ Talks Ongoing
Summary of Affected Agency's Comments
Will there need to be further negotiation? ___ YES ___ NO

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) NONE
State NONE
Federal NONE
Additional notes on fiscal impact

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

Change in language for clarification purposes only.

Sec. 10-10a. ~~[Public school information system]~~ State Longitudinal Data System. Definitions. Development and implementation. Types of data collected. Access to data maintained under system. (a) As used in this section:

(1) "Teacher" means any certified professional employee below the rank of superintendent employed by a board of education for at least ninety days in a position requiring a certificate issued by the State Board of Education;

(2) "Teacher preparation program" means a program designed to qualify an individual for

professional certification as an educator provided by institutions of higher education or other providers approved by the Department of Education, including, but not limited to, an alternate route to certification program.

(b) The Department of Education shall develop and implement a ~~[state-wide public school information system]~~ **state longitudinal data system**. The system shall be designed for the purpose of establishing a standardized electronic data collection and reporting protocol that will facilitate compliance with state and federal reporting requirements, improve school-to-school and district-to-district information exchanges, and maintain the confidentiality of individual student and staff data. The initial design shall focus on student information, **collected through the state-wide public school information system (PSIS)**, provided the system shall be created to allow for future compatibility with financial, facility and staff data. The system shall provide for the tracking of the performance of individual students on each of the state-wide mastery examinations under section 10-14n in order to allow the department to compare the progress of the same cohort of students who take each examination and to better analyze school performance. The department shall assign a unique student identifier to each student prior to tracking the performance of a student in ~~[state-wide public school information system]~~ **state longitudinal data system**.

(c) On or before July 1, 2013, the department shall expand ~~[state-wide public school information system]~~ **state longitudinal data system**. as follows:

(1) Track and report data relating to student, teacher and school and district performance growth and make such information available to local and regional boards of education for use in evaluating educational performance and growth of teachers and students enrolled in public schools in the state. Such information shall be collected or calculated based on information received from local and regional boards of education and other relevant sources. Such information shall include, but not be limited to:

(A) In addition to performance on state-wide mastery examinations pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, data relating to students shall include, but not be limited to, (i) the primary language spoken at the home of a student, (ii) student transcripts, (iii) student attendance and student mobility, and (iv) reliable, valid assessments of a student's readiness to enter public school at the kindergarten level;

(B) Data relating to teachers shall include, but not be limited to, (i) teacher credentials, such as master's degrees, teacher preparation programs completed and certification levels and endorsement areas, (ii) teacher assessments, such as whether a teacher is deemed highly qualified pursuant to the No Child Left Behind Act, P.L. 107-110, or deemed to meet such other designations as may be established by federal law or regulations for the purposes of tracking the equitable distribution of instructional staff, (iii) the presence of substitute teachers in a teacher's classroom, (iv) class size, (v) numbers relating to absenteeism in a teacher's classroom, and (vi) the presence of a teacher's aide. The department shall assign a unique

teacher identifier to each teacher prior to collecting such data in the public school information system;

(C) Data relating to schools and districts shall include, but not be limited to, (i) school population, (ii) annual student graduation rates, (iii) annual teacher retention rates, (iv) school disciplinary records, such as data relating to suspensions, expulsions and other disciplinary actions, (v) the percentage of students whose primary language is not English, (vi) the number of and professional credentials of support personnel, and (vii) information relating to instructional technology, such as access to computers.

(2) Collect data relating to student enrollment in and graduation from institutions of higher education for any student who had been assigned a unique student identifier pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, provided such data is available.

(3) Develop means for access to and data sharing with the data systems of public institutions of higher education in the state.

(d) On or before July 1, 2011, and each year thereafter until July 1, 2013, the Commissioner of Education shall report, in accordance with the provisions of section 11-4a, to the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to education on the progress of the department's efforts to expand ~~[state-wide public school information system]~~ **state longitudinal data system** pursuant to subsection (c) of this section. The report shall include a full statement of those data elements that are currently included in the system and those data elements that will be added on or before July 1, 2013.

(e) The system database of student information shall not be considered a public record for the purposes of section 1-210. Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the ability of a full-time permanent employee of a nonprofit organization that is exempt from taxation under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or any subsequent corresponding internal revenue code of the United States, as from time to time amended, and that is organized and operated for educational purposes, to obtain information in accordance with the provisions of subsection (h) of this section.

(f) All school districts shall participate in the system, and report all necessary information required by this section, provided the department provides for technical assistance and training of school staff in the use of the system.

(g) Local and regional boards of education and preschool programs which receive state or federal funding shall participate, in a manner prescribed by the Commissioner of Education, ~~[in the state-wide public school information system]~~ **collected through the designated agency-managed data applications** described in subsection (b) of this section. Participation for purposes of this subsection shall include, but not be limited to, reporting on (1) student experiences in preschool by program type and by numbers of months in each such program,

and (2) the readiness of students entering kindergarten and student progress in kindergarten. Such reporting shall be done by October 1, 2007, and annually thereafter.

(h) On and after August 1, 2009, upon receipt of a written request to access data maintained under this section by a full-time permanent employee of a nonprofit organization that is exempt from taxation under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or any subsequent corresponding internal revenue code of the United States, as from time to time amended, and that is organized and operated for educational purposes, the Department of Education shall provide such data to such requesting party not later than sixty days after such request, provided such requesting party shall be responsible for the reasonable cost of such request. The Department of Information Technology shall monitor the calculation of such fees charged for access to or copies of such records to ensure that such fees are reasonable and consistent with those charged by other state agencies. The Department of Education shall respond to written requests under this section in the order in which they are received.

Agency Legislative Proposal - 2013 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): 082712_SDE_SchoolReadinessFlexibility

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: State Department of Education (SDE)

Liaison: Sarah Hemingway

Phone: 860-713-6493

E-mail: Sarah.Hemingway@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Talent Office, Bureau of Teaching and Learning

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Gerri Rowell

Title of Proposal

Competitive School Readiness Eligibility Flexibility

Statutory Reference

10-16p

Proposal Summary

This proposal will change the language to allow greater flexibility for distribution of unallocated competitive school readiness funds after each eligible grantee receives the base grant of \$107,000.

Please attach a copy of fully drafted bill (required for review)

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

• Reason for Proposal

Please consider the following, if applicable:

Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary?

Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)?

Have certain constituencies called for this action?

What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session?

Per the legislation, any unallocated funds may be distributed to towns with two or more priority schools if they can provide additional spaces for children. If other competitive school readiness grantees could serve additional children, the current law only allows funds to go to towns with two or more priority schools. Legislation was changed to include the 50 lowest wealth rank towns in the competitive grant, therefore, unallocated funds should be available to all eligible competitive municipalities seeking additional spaces for eligible children. This change would allow more children to be served in competitive school readiness communities.

• Origin of Proposal

☐ New Proposal

☒ Resubmission

If this is a resubmission, please share:

*What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?
Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?
Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?
What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?*

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: None

Agency Contact (name, title, phone):

Date Contacted:

Approve of Proposal ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ Talks Ongoing

Summary of Affected Agency's Comments

Will there need to be further negotiation? ☐ YES ☐ NO

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) NONE

State
NONE

Federal
NONE

Additional notes on fiscal impact

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

This change would allow for more children to be served across all eligible Competitive School Readiness Communities.

(d) (1) The Commissioner of Education, in consultation with the Commissioner of Social Services, shall establish a competitive grant program to provide spaces in accredited school readiness programs for eligible children who reside (A) in an area served by a priority school or a former priority school as provided for in subdivision (2) of this subsection, (B) in a town ranked one to fifty when all towns are ranked in ascending order according to town wealth, as defined in subdivision (26) of section 10-262f, whose school district is not a priority school district pursuant to section 10-266pd or (C) in a town formerly a town described in subparagraph (B) of this subdivision, as provided for in said subdivision (2). A town in which a priority school is located, a regional school readiness council, pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-16r, for a region in which such a school is located or a town described in subparagraph (B) of this subdivision may apply for such a grant in an amount not to exceed one hundred seven thousand dollars per priority school or town. Eligibility shall be determined for a five-year period based on an applicant's designation as having a priority school or being a town described in subparagraph (B) of this subdivision for the initial year of application. Grant awards shall be made annually contingent upon available funding and a satisfactory annual evaluation. The chief elected official of such town and the superintendent of schools of the school district or the regional school readiness council shall submit a plan, as described in subsection (c) of this section, for the expenditure of such grant funds to the Department of Education. In awarding grants pursuant to this subsection, the commissioner shall give preference to applications submitted by regional school readiness councils and may, within available appropriations, provide a grant in excess of one hundred seven thousand dollars to towns ~~[with two or more priority schools in such district]~~ seeking additional spaces in accredited school readiness programs for eligible children. A town or regional school readiness council awarded a grant pursuant to this subsection shall use the funds to purchase spaces for such children from providers of accredited school readiness programs.

Agency Legislative Proposal - 2013 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc):
082712_SDE_SchoolReadinessAnnualProgressReporting

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: State Department of Education (SDE)

Liaison: Sarah Hemingway
Phone: 860-713-6493
E-mail: Sarah.Hemingway@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Talent Office, Bureau of Teaching and Learning

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Gerri Rowell/Deb Adams

Title of Proposal
School Readiness Annual Progress Reporting

Statutory Reference
10-16q

Proposal Summary
10-16q outlines the quality components required for the School Readiness Grant Program, one of which includes an annual evaluation of the effectiveness of the program. Currently, the CT School Readiness Preschool Program Evaluation System (CSRPPES) is the self-reporting mechanism by which programs conduct the evaluation. All programs began using the CSRPPES in July of 2000. This proposal requests that a more appropriate progress monitoring system be developed and the CSRPPES no longer is required.

Please attach a copy of fully drafted bill (required for review)

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- **Reason for Proposal**

Please consider the following, if applicable:

Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary?

Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)?

Have certain constituencies called for this action?

What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session?

A shift from the self-report CSRPPES to a monitoring system allows for the program and the state to examine the conditions of programs through the lens of quality improvement in alignment with the existing approval systems (NAEYC and Head Start). Less paperwork and more authentic information would benefit both the program and the State in efforts to monitor effectiveness.

- **Origin of Proposal**

☒ **New Proposal**

☐ **Resubmission**

If this is a resubmission, please share:

*What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?
Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?
Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?
What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?*

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: None

Agency Contact (name, title, phone):

Date Contacted:

Approve of Proposal ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ Talks Ongoing

Summary of Affected Agency's Comments

Will there need to be further negotiation? ☐ YES ☐ NO

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) NONE

State
NONE

Federal
NONE

Additional notes on fiscal impact

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

This change would reduce paperwork for programs and the state and align program progress with objectives associated with approval systems.

Sec. 10-16q. School readiness program requirements. Per child cost limitation. Sliding fee scale. Waiver from schedule requirements.

(11) an annual ~~[evaluation]~~ progress report ~~[of]~~ on the ~~[effectiveness]~~ goals and objectives of the School Readiness Grant program. On and after July 1, ~~[2000]~~ 2013, school readiness programs shall use the assessment measures developed pursuant to section 10-16s in conducting their annual ~~[evaluations]~~ progress reports.

Agency Legislative Proposal - 2013 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): 082712_SDE_SchoolReadinessMOU

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: State Department of Education (SDE)

Liaison: Sarah Hemingway

Phone: 860-713-6493

E-mail: Sarah.Hemingway@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Talent Office, Bureau of Teaching and Learning

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Gerri Rowell/Deb Adams

Title of Proposal

School Readiness MOU Reporting and Assessment Measures

Statutory Reference

10-16s

Proposal Summary

10-16s outlines the agreement between the State Department of Education and the Department of Social Services on matters addressing the School Readiness Grant Programs and assessment measures used to evaluate the effectiveness of such programs. This proposal maintains the reporting of the agreement to the Joint Standing Committee but deletes reporting requirements to the Early Childhood Cabinet and adjusts the language addressing the assessments measures to align with the changes proposed in 10-16q.

Please attach a copy of fully drafted bill (required for review)

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

• Reason for Proposal

Please consider the following, if applicable:

Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary?

Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)?

Have certain constituencies called for this action?

What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session?

In the reconstitution of the Early Childhood Cabinet and its mission it is no longer applicable for the agreement between agencies to be submitted to the Cabinet. The adjustment of language addressing the assessment measures aligns with the changes proposed in 10-16q.

• Origin of Proposal

 x New Proposal

 Resubmission

If this is a resubmission, please share:

*What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?
Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?
Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?
What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?*

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: None

Agency Contact (name, title, phone):

Date Contacted:

Approve of Proposal ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ Talks Ongoing

Summary of Affected Agency's Comments

Will there need to be further negotiation? ☐ YES ☐ NO

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) NONE

State
NONE

Federal
NONE

Additional notes on fiscal impact

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

No impact on policy or program.

Sec. 10-16s. Interagency agreement on school readiness. Assessment measures.

(a) The Commissioners of Education and Social Services shall develop an agreement to define the duties and responsibilities of their departments concerning school readiness programs. The commissioners shall consult with other affected state agencies. The agreement shall include, but not be limited to, a multiyear interagency agreement to establish and implement an integrated school readiness plan. Functions to be described and responsibilities to be undertaken by the two departments shall be delineated in the agreement. ~~[On or before January 1, 2010, and annually thereafter, the Commissioners of Education and Social Services shall submit such agreement, in accordance with the provisions of section 11-4a, to the Early Childhood Education Cabinet, established pursuant to section 10-16z, and]~~ In accordance with the provisions of section 11-4a the Commissioners of Education and Social Services shall submit such agreement to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to education and human services.

(b) On or before ~~[January 1, 2008]~~ July 1, 2013, the commissioners shall adopt assessment measures of school readiness programs for use by such programs in conducting their annual ~~[evaluations]~~ progress reports pursuant to section 10-16q. The commissioners may adopt the assessment measures used for Head Start programs.

Agency Legislative Proposal - 2013 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): 082712_SDE_Fingerprinting

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: State Department of Education (SDE)

Liaison: Sarah Hemingway

Phone: 860-713-6493

E-mail: Sarah.Hemingway@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Talent Office, Bureau of Teaching and Learning

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Deb Adams

Title of Proposal

Early Childhood Fingerprinting: Sharing of Information

Statutory Reference

19a-80 & 10-221d

Proposal Summary

This proposal will allow for students conducting observations and practicum work and child care staff re-locating to other licensed facilities to use their initial set of fingerprints across locations and eliminate duplicate printing and fees.

Please attach a copy of fully drafted bill (required for review)

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

• Reason for Proposal

Please consider the following, if applicable:

Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary?

Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)?

Have certain constituencies called for this action?

What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session?

The statutes do not allow the transmission of fingerprinting data or results between authorized parties thereby causing individuals (especially students conducting observations and practicum work in facilities) to be fingerprinted multiple times for each setting and pay a fee for each printing. Constituencies calling for action include higher education institutions and licensed child care providers.

• Origin of Proposal

 x New Proposal

 Resubmission

If this is a resubmission, please share:

*What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?
Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?
Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?
What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?*

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: Department of Public Health

Agency Contact (name, title, phone):

Date Contacted:

Approve of Proposal ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ Talks Ongoing

Summary of Affected Agency's Comments

Being coordinated through the Early Childhood Planner.

Will there need to be further negotiation? ☐ YES ☐ NO

- **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) NONE

State
NONE

Federal
NONE

Additional notes on fiscal impact

- **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

Policies could be developed addressing a timeframe by which fingerprints are in effect. For example, for students conducting practicum work one set of prints could be effective for 2 years. For staff moving from licensed programs or schools for employment reasons the timeframe could be for one year or for every time a person changes employment.

Sec. 19a-80. (Formerly Sec. 19-43e). License required for child day care centers and group day care homes. Fees. Criminal history records checks. Notification of changes in regulations.

c) The Commissioner of Public Health, within available appropriations, shall require each prospective employee of a child day care center or group day care home in a position requiring the provision of care to a child to submit to state and national criminal history records checks. The criminal history records checks required pursuant to this subsection shall be conducted in accordance with section 29-17a. The commissioner shall also request a check of the state child abuse registry established pursuant to section 17a-101k. Pursuant to the interagency agreement provided for in section 10-16s, the Department of Social Services may agree to transfer funds appropriated for criminal history records checks to the Department of Public Health. The commissioner shall notify each licensee of the provisions of this subsection. **The Department of Public Health shall make available fingerprinting results to the RESCS and licensed providers when staff and students requiring fingerprints re-locate to other licensed facilities or public schools.**

Sec. 10-221d. Criminal history records checks of school personnel. Fingerprinting. Termination or dismissal.

(a) Each local and regional board of education shall (1) require each applicant for a position in a public school to state whether such person has ever been convicted of a crime or whether criminal charges are pending against such person at the time of such person's application, (2) require, subject to the provisions of subsection (d) of this section, each person hired by the board after July 1, 1994, to submit to state and national criminal history records checks within thirty days from the date of employment and may require, subject to the provisions of subsection (d) of this section, any person hired prior to said date to submit to state and national criminal history records checks, and (3) require each worker (A) placed within a school under a public assistance employment program, (B) employed by a provider of supplemental services pursuant to the No Child Left Behind Act, P.L. 107-110, or (C) on and after July 1, 2010, in a nonpaid, noncertified position completing preparation requirements for the issuance of an educator certificate pursuant to chapter 166, who performs a service involving direct student contact to submit to state and national criminal history records checks within thirty days from the date such worker begins to perform such service. The criminal history records checks required by this subsection shall be conducted in accordance with section 29-17a.

Agency Legislative Proposal - 2013 Session

Document Name (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): 082712_SDE_Headstart

(If submitting an electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: State Department of Education (SDE)

Liaison: Sarah Hemingway

Phone: 860-713-6493

E-mail: Sarah.Hemingway@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Talent Office, Bureau of Teaching and Learning

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Andrea Brinnel

Title of Proposal: Head Start Advisory Council

Statutory Reference Chapter 164, Sec.10-16n

Proposal Summary

This proposal recommends the following changes/additions to the Head Start Advisory Committee membership as detailed in the CT General Statute cited above:

1. School Readiness Coordinators change to School Readiness Liaison.
2. School program sites change to Board of Education sites.
3. Early Childhood Education Council change to Early Childhood Education Cabinet.
4. Head Start Directors Association change to Head Start Association.
5. Office of Human Development Services, Office of Community Programs, Region I change to Region I Head Start, Administration for Children and Families.
6. Addition of the Director of the Head Start Collaboration Office.
7. One appointment from a CAP agency by The Speaker of the House.
8. One appointment of a School Readiness Liaison by the president pro tem of the Senate.

This proposal recommends the following change to the funding formula in the CT General Statute cited above:

9. This proposal recommends updating the calculation used in section (b) as the current calculation for eligibility for these funds is based on 1996 aid to dependent children and does not accurately reflect the current distribution of poverty in the state.

Please attach a copy of fully drafted bill (required for review)

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

- **Reason for Proposal**

- 1) The change from School Readiness coordinator to School Readiness liaison is proposed in keeping with the language used in School Readiness.
- 2) Currently, the statute reads, "...two from school program sites..." It is proposed to change this to Board of Education sites, to clarify the type of school that the appointment is from.
- 3) The Early Childhood Education Council no longer exists, it is recommended to change this member to be a representative from the Early Childhood Education Cabinet.
- 4) The statute refers to an appointment from the Head Start Director's Association. The accurate name should be the Head Start Association. In addition, the member designated by the association is recommended to currently have or previously have had a child in a Head Start program to allow for parent membership and participation. An additional designee from the Director's Association is recommended to be added to allow for additional authentic representation from the association as the Head Start Association if the primary organization representing Head Start in the state.
- 5) A technical change to correct the name of the Region I Head Start office is recommended.
- 6) The Head Start Advisory Committee was formed prior to the creation of the Head Start Collaboration Office. The Head Start Collaboration Office should be included in the membership as the Collaboration Office is an integral part of state Head Start.
- 7) Currently the statute reads, "...two members from community action agency program sites or school readiness coordinators, one of whom shall be appointed by the president pro tempore of the Senate and one by the speaker of the House of Representatives". This proposal recommends that the Speaker of the House of Representatives appoint a member from a community action agency and the president pro tempore of the Senate appoint a School Readiness liaison. This would ensure representation from both a community action agency and from School Readiness
- 8) See # 7 above
- 9) Currently the statute reads, "The Department of Education shall annually allocate to each town in which the number of children under the aid to dependent children program, as defined in subdivision (14) of section 10-262f, equals or exceeds nine hundred children, determined for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1996, an amount equal to one hundred fifty thousand dollars plus eight and one-half dollars for each child under the aid to dependent children program...". It is proposed that this statute be changed to be based on current poverty counts and recalculated every 6 years after the initial determination; these counts more accurately reflect the distribution of poverty in the state.

- **Origin of Proposal** x **New Proposal** **Resubmission**

If this is a resubmission, please share:

What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?

Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?

Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?

What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?

PROPOSAL IMPACT

- **Agencies Affected** (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: Agency Contact (name, title, phone): Date Contacted: Approve of Proposal ___ YES ___ NO ___ Talks Ongoing
Summary of Affected Agency's Comments
Will there need to be further negotiation? ___ YES ___ NO

• **Fiscal Impact** (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation) The change from 1996 aid for dependent children funding to the current number of children below the level of poverty as defined in subdivision (34) of section 10-262f will result in a different distribution of funds among the sixteen communities identified (simulation attached).
State NONE
Federal NONE
Additional notes on fiscal impact

• **Policy and Programmatic Impacts** (Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)

--

Sec. 10-16n. Head Start grant program. Grant allocation. Advisory committee. (a) The Commissioner of Education, in consultation with the Commissioner of Social Services, shall establish a competitive grant program to assist nonprofit agencies and local and regional boards of education, which are federal Head Start grantees, in (1) establishing extended-day and full-day, year-round, Head Start programs or expanding existing Head Start programs to extended-day or full-day, year-round programs, (2) enhancing program quality and (3) increasing the number of children served. The commissioner, after consultation with the committee established pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, shall establish criteria for the grants, provided at least twenty-five per cent of the funding for such grants shall be for the purpose of enhancing program quality. Nonprofit agencies or boards of education seeking grants pursuant to this section shall make application to the Commissioner of Education on such forms and at such times as the commissioner shall prescribe. All grants pursuant to this section shall be funded within the limits of available appropriations or otherwise from federal funds and private donations. All full-day,

year-round Head Start programs funded pursuant to this section shall be in compliance with federal Head Start performance standards.

(b) Within the available appropriation, The Department of Education shall annually allocate to each town ~~[in which the number of children under the aid to dependent children program, as defined in subdivision (14) of section 10-262f, equals or exceeds nine hundred children, determined for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1996,]~~ that is ranked from one to sixteen when all towns are ranked in descending order from one to one hundred sixty nine based on the number of children below the level of poverty, as defined in subdivision (34) of section 10-262f an amount equal to 1) one hundred fifty thousand dollars plus 2) an amount equal to the product obtained by multiplying any funds remaining in the appropriation available for such purpose by the ratio which the number of children below the level of poverty for such town bears to the total number of such children for the sixteen towns. ~~[eight and one-half dollars for each child under the aid to dependent children program, provided such amount may be reduced proportionately so that the total amount awarded pursuant to this subsection does not exceed two million seven hundred thousand dollars. The department shall award grants to the local and regional boards of education for such towns and nonprofit agencies located in such towns which meet the criteria established pursuant to subsection (a) of this section to maintain the programs established or expanded with funds provided pursuant to this subsection in the fiscal years ending June 30, 1996, and June 30, 1997. Any funds remaining in the allocation to such a town after grants are so awarded shall be used to increase allocations to other such towns. Any funds remaining after grants are so awarded to boards of education and nonprofit agencies in all such towns shall be available to local and regional boards of education and nonprofit agencies in other towns in the state for grants for such purposes.~~

~~-(a) of this section to maintain the programs established or expanded with funds provided pursuant to this subsection in the fiscal years ending June 30, 1996, and June 30, 1997.]~~ Any funds remaining in the allocation to such a town after grants are so awarded shall be used to increase allocations to other such towns. The Department of Education shall ~~[bi annually]~~ every six years allocate to the 16 towns with the highest level of poverty using the ~~[federal Title 1 poverty counts]~~ calculation method above. Any funds remaining after grants are so awarded to boards of education and nonprofit agencies in all such towns shall be available to local and regional boards of education and nonprofit agencies in other towns in the state for grants for such purposes.

(c) There is established a committee to advise the Commissioner of Education concerning the coordination, priorities for allocation and distribution, and utilization of funds for Head Start and concerning the competitive grant program established under this section, and to evaluate programs funded pursuant to this section. The committee shall consist of twelve members as follows: One member designated by the Commissioner of Social Services; six members who are directors of Head Start programs, ~~[two]~~ one from a community action agency program site ~~[s]~~ appointed by the speaker of the house [or] and one school readiness liaison [coordinators], [one of] who [m] shall be appointed by the president pro tempore of the Senate ~~[and one by the speaker of the House of Representatives]~~, two from board of education sites [from school program sites], one of whom shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate and one by the majority leader of the House of Representatives, and two from other nonprofit agency program sites, one of whom shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate and one by the minority leader of the House of Representatives; one member designated by the Commission on Children; one member designated by the early childhood education [Council] cabinet; two members designated by the head start [Directors] association one of whom shall be the parent of a present or former head start student; one member designated by the Connecticut

Association for Community Action who shall have expertise and experience concerning Head Start; and one member designated by the Region I Office of ~~Human Development Services, Office of Community Programs, Region 1~~ the federal Department of Health and Human Services; Head Start, Administration for Children and Families and the Director of the Head Start Collaboration Office.

(d) The Commissioner of Education may adopt regulations, in accordance with the provisions of chapter 54, for purposes of this section.

Simulation for Part 9

Connecticut State Department of Education

Bureau of Grants Management

Simulated 2012-13 Head Start Services Allocations

Comparison of entitlements from simulated to current law

Town Code	Town name	Simulated Head Start Entitlement	Current Law Head Start Entitlement	Difference in Entitlements
15	Bridgeport	201,377	211,284	-9,907
17	Bristol	159,747	148,484	11,263
34	Danbury	162,180	150,227	11,953
43	East Hartford	162,612	151,906	10,706
64	Hartford	206,659	258,637	-51,978
77	Manchester	159,355	147,943	11,412
80	Meriden	165,821	157,866	7,955
89	New Britain	174,857	169,905	4,952
93	New Haven	196,920	212,222	-15,302
95	New London	157,419	150,203	7,216
103	Norwalk	162,940	152,256	10,684
104	Norwich	158,827	149,551	9,276
135	Stamford	167,310	156,481	10,829
151	Waterbury	192,943	182,390	10,553
156	West Haven	161,484	151,954	9,530
163	Windham	157,699	148,691	9,008
		=====	=====	=====
		2,748,150	2,700,000	48,150